



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/631,070	07/31/2003	Yen-Fu Chen	AUS920030524US1	3480

37945 7590 10/05/2009
DUKE W. YEE
YEE AND ASSOCIATES, P.C.
P.O. BOX 802333
DALLAS, TX 75380

EXAMINER

NEWAY, SAMUEL G

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2626

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

10/05/2009

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ptonotifs@yeeiplaw.com



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/631,070
Filing Date: July 31, 2003
Appellant(s): CHEN ET AL.

Rudolf O. Siegesmund
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 17 March appealing from the Office action mailed 17 October 2007.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The following are the related appeals, interferences, and judicial proceedings known to the examiner which may be related to, directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal:

Application No. 10/617,526 and Application No. 10/617,530 are related and on appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

Chinese-English Dictionary

(<http://web.archive.org/web/20001204034200/http://www.mandarintools.com/>),

Chinese-English Lookup

(<http://web.archive.org/web/20010309104519/http://home.iprimus.com.au/richwarm/cel/cel.htm>),

Foolsworkshop

(<http://web.archive.org/web/20021206035901/http://www.foolsworkshop.com/ptou/>),

Hill et al (USPN 6,023,714).

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 15 – 19, and 40 – 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chinese-English Dictionary

(<http://web.archive.org/web/20001204034200/http://www.mandarintools.com/>) in view of Chinese-English Lookup

(<http://web.archive.org/web/20010309104519/http://home.iprimus.com.au/richwarm/cel/cel.htm>) referred as Lookup hereinafter.

Claim 15:

Chinese-English Dictionary discloses a method comprising:

using a computer having a display (“Look It Up”, Figure on page 1) and connected to the internet (“download the dictionary at the CEDICT website”, page 1),

accepting a user input of a Pin Yin word (“searching by Pin Yin”, page 1)

determining if the user input is an entire desired word, a beginning of the entire word, or whether the user input appears anywhere in the desired word (“find entries that start with the characters, end with the characters, or have the characters anywhere ...”, page 1);

Art Unit: 2626

searching a dictionary for an entry containing the Pin Yin word (“this Chinese/English dictionary ...”, page 1)

using Unicode to translate a Pin Yin word into a Traditional Chinese character, a Simplified Chinese character, and an English word (“searches can be conducted by Chinese (using either the GB, Big5, or Unicode encodings), ... results will show the Chinese word, the Pin Yin representation of the word, and the English definition”, page 1).

However, Chinese-English Dictionary does not explicitly teach simultaneously displaying the translations responsive to a user activation of a single control.

Lookup discloses a similar Chinese-English dictionary where a user is able to select and copy a word from a Web browsers or a word processor in order to get a desired translation and displaying the translated characters in the graphical user interface in response to an activation of a single control (Figure on top of page 1. Note the simultaneous display of the Chinese, Pin Yin, and English equivalents).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to simultaneously display the translated characters in Chinese-English Dictionary’s graphical user interface in response to an activation of a single control in order to “help Chinese language learners to read Chinese electronic texts ...” (Lookup, page 1, paragraph 2).

Claim 16:

Art Unit: 2626

Chinese-English Dictionary and Lookup disclose the method of claim 15, Chinese-English Dictionary further discloses wherein the entry exactly matches the Pin Yin word (“the Pin Yin at the beginning, end, anywhere, or as the whole entry”, page 1).

Claim 17:

Chinese-English Dictionary and Lookup disclose the method of claim 15, Chinese-English Dictionary further discloses wherein the entry begins with the Pin Yin word (“the Pin Yin at the beginning, end, anywhere, or as the whole entry”, page 1).

Claim 18:

Chinese-English Dictionary and Lookup disclose the method of claim 15, Chinese-English Dictionary further discloses the entry contains the Pin Yin word anywhere in the entry (“the Pin Yin at the beginning, end, anywhere, or as the whole entry”, page 1).

Claim 19:

Chinese-English Dictionary and Lookup disclose the method of claim 15, Chinese-English Dictionary further discloses wherein the Pin Yin word is an unaccented Pin Yin word or a hybrid Pin Yin word (“you can include or exclude tone numbers, ... you would type “dian shi ji” or “dian4 shi4 ji1” ...”, page 1).

Claims 40 – 44:

Claims 40 – 44 are similar in scope and content to claims 15 – 19; therefore they are rejected with the same rationale.

Art Unit: 2626

3. Claims 1 – 6, 8 – 13, 21 – 24, 26 – 31, 33 – 38, and 46 – 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chinese-English Dictionary

(<http://web.archive.org/web/20001204034200/http://www.mandarintools.com/>) in view of Lookup and in further view of Foolsworkshop

(<http://web.archive.org/web/20021206035901/http://www.foolsworkshop.com/ptou/>).

Claim 1:

Chinese-English Dictionary discloses a method comprising:

using a computer having a display (“Look It Up”, Figure on page 1) and connected to the internet (“download the dictionary at the CEDICT website”, page 1),

accepting a user input of a Simplified Chinese word (“searching by Chinese”, page 1)

determining if the user input is an entire desired word, a beginning of the entire word, or whether the user input appears anywhere in the desired word (“find entries that start with the characters, end with the characters, or have the characters anywhere ...”, page 1);

searching a dictionary for an entry containing the Simplified Chinese word (“this Chinese/English dictionary ...”, page 1)

using Unicode to translate the Simplified Chinese word into a Traditional Chinese character, a Pin Yin word, and an English word (“searches can be conducted by Chinese (using either the GB, Big5, or Unicode encodings), ... results will show the Chinese word, the Pin Yin representation of the word, and the English definition”, page 1).

Art Unit: 2626

However, Chinese-English Dictionary does not explicitly teach simultaneously displaying characters responsive to a user activation of a single control.

Lookup discloses a similar Chinese-English dictionary where a user is able to select and copy a word from a Web browsers or a word processor in order to get a desired translation and displaying the translated characters in the graphical user interface in response to an activation of a single control (Figure on top of page 1. Note the simultaneous display of the Chinese, Pin Yin, and English equivalents).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to simultaneously display the translated characters in Chinese-English Dictionary's graphical user interface in response to an activation of a single control in order to "help Chinese language learners to read Chinese electronic texts ..." (Lookup, page 1, paragraph 2).

Chinese-English Dictionary and Lookup do not explicitly teach accented Pin Yin translations.

Foolsworkshop discloses a method of translating Pin Yin into accented Pin Yin ("converts text written in pinyin, with syllable-final tone numbers, into unicode" Note that unicode in this situation represents accented Pin Yin).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to display Pin Yin as accented Pin Yin because "many students and instructors of the Chinese language have a need to display pinyin with tone marks in their documents" so they are easier to read (Foolsworkshop, first line).

Claim 2:

Art Unit: 2626

Chinese-English Dictionary, Lookup and Foolsworkshop disclose the method of claim 1, Chinese-English Dictionary further discloses wherein the entry exactly matches the Simplified Chinese word (“return Chinese entries that exactly match the word ...”, page 1).

Claim 3:

Chinese-English Dictionary, Lookup and Foolsworkshop disclose the method of claim 1, Chinese-English Dictionary further discloses wherein the entry begins with the Simplified Chinese word (“find entries that start with the characters ...”, page 1).

Claim 4:

Chinese-English Dictionary, Lookup and Foolsworkshop disclose the method of claim 1, Chinese-English Dictionary further discloses wherein the entry contains the Simplified Chinese word anywhere in the entry (“have the characters anywhere ...”, page 1).

Claim 5:

Chinese-English Dictionary, Lookup and Foolsworkshop disclose the method of claim 1, Chinese-English Dictionary further discloses: accepting the Simplified Chinese character as user input, wherein the Simplified Chinese character is encoded in GB2312 or Unicode (“return the results in GB ... or Unicode”, page 1).

Claim 6:

Chinese-English Dictionary, Lookup and Foolsworkshop disclose the method of claim 1, Chinese-English Dictionary further discloses: translating the Simplified Chinese character from GB2312 to Unicode (“return the results in GB ... or Unicode”, page 1).

Art Unit: 2626

Claims 8 – 13, 21 – 24, 26 – 31, 33 – 38, and 46 – 49:

Claims 8 – 13, 21 – 24, 26 – 31, 33 – 38, and 46 – 49 are similar in scope and content to claims 1 – 6; therefore claims 8 – 13, 21 – 24, 26 – 31, 33 – 38, and 46 – 49 are rejected with the same rationale.

4. Claims 20 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chinese-English Dictionary (<http://web.archive.org/web/20001204034200/http://www.mandarintools.com/>) in view of Lookup and in further view of Hill et al. (USPN 6,023,714)

Claims 20 and 45:

Chinese-English Dictionary and Lookup disclose the method of claim 15, further but Chinese-English Dictionary does not explicitly disclose the font size as being user configurable.

Hill discloses a method for displaying (similar to Chinese-English displaying) where a browser's font size is user defined.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to make the font size of Chinese-English Dictionary user configured in order "For example, a sight impaired user may define a large browser font size so that a computer-displayed document is easier to read" (Hill, col. 9, lines 33-35).

5. Claims 7, 14, 25, 32, 39, and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chinese-English Dictionary

Art Unit: 2626

(<http://web.archive.org/web/20001204034200/http://www.mandarintools.com/>) in view

Lookup, in further view of Foolsworkshop

(<http://web.archive.org/web/20021206035901/http://www.foolsworkshop.com/ptou/>) and

in further view of Hill et al. (USPN 6,023,714)

Claims 7, 14, 25, 32, 39, and 50:

Chinese-English Dictionary, Lookup, and Foolsworkshop disclose the method of claim 1,

but Chinese-English Dictionary does not explicitly disclose the font size as being user configurable.

Hill discloses a method for displaying (similar to Chinese-English displaying) where a browser's font size is user defined.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to make the font size of Chinese-English Dictionary user configured in order "for example, a sight impaired user may define a large browser font size so that a computer-displayed document is easier to read" (Hill, col. 9, lines 33-35).

(10) Response to Argument

Regarding the prior art rejections of claims 15 – 19 and 40 – 44, Appellants argue that the combination of Chinese-English Dictionary and Lookup (CEL Web Page) fails to disclose "simultaneously displaying ... the Simplified Chinese character [and] the Traditional Chinese word" (Appeal Brief, page 8) . Specifically Appellants argue that CEL displays the original Traditional Chinese character, a Pin Yin word, and an English

Art Unit: 2626

translation but fails to disclose displaying a Simplified Chinese translation. However, it is Chinese-English Dictionary which is relied upon to teach the different translations (translating any input from the list including Traditional Chinese, Simplified Chinese, Pin Yin, and English into any other language/representation in the list). Lookup (CEL Web Page) is relied upon to teach displaying a translated input word and its multiple translations simultaneously. It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to have used Lookup's teaching of simultaneously displaying a word and many of the word's translations to display Chinese-English Dictionary's input word along with its many translations. The combination of Chinese-English Dictionary and Lookup therefore teaches "simultaneously displaying ... the Simplified Chinese character [and] the Traditional Chinese word".

Appellants also argue that the combination of Chinese-English Dictionary and Lookup (CEL Web Page) fails to disclose "responsive to a user activation of a single control ... displaying" because Lookup (CEL Web Page) is silent to responding to activating a single control to pop up its display (Appeal Brief, page 8). The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Lookup (CEL Web Page) discloses triggering the dictionary displaying the translations not only automatically (as Appellants argue) but also manually (Page 1, Section entitled "What's new in Version 2.0?") which reads on Appellants' "responsive to a user activation of a single control ... displaying".

Regarding the prior art rejections of claims 1 – 6, 8 – 13, 21 – 24, 26 – 31, 33 – 38, and 46 – 49, the arguments advanced by Appellants are similar to the ones

Art Unit: 2626

presented in regards to claims 15 – 19. Therefore the above discussions put forth by the Examiner apply against the arguments advanced by appellants regarding the prior art rejections of the claims 1 – 6, 8 – 13, 21 – 24, 26 – 31, 33 – 38, and 46 – 49.

Regarding the prior art rejections of claims 20 and 45, Appellants argue that Hill does not teach a first font size for Chinese characters and a second font size for English characters where the first font size is bigger than the second font size. However, it is the combination of Lookup and Hill that is relied upon as teaching this limitation. Lookup discloses different font sizes for the Chinese characters and the English characters (see the CEL window where the Chinese characters are bigger than the English characters). Hill is relied upon for teaching user configurable font sizes. Hill discloses a user-defined browser font size (col. 9, lines 27-31). It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to have made the font sizes of the characters present in CEL window user configurable.

Regarding the prior art rejections of claims 7, 14, 25, 32, 39, and 50, the arguments advanced by Appellants are similar to the ones presented in regards to claims 20 and 45. Therefore the above discussions put forth by the Examiner apply against the arguments advanced by appellants regarding the prior art rejections of the claims 7, 14, 25, 32, 39, and 50.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

Samuel G. Neway
/S. G. N./

/David R Hudspeth/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2626

Conferees:

Samuel G. Neway
/S. G. N./

/David R Hudspeth/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2626

/Talivaldis Ivars Smits/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2626